

# **Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization**

**COORDINATING COMMUNITY-BASED  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
IN THE PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD:**

**Approaches and Challenges of the People of Phillips**

A CONSORTIUM PROJECT OF: Augsburg College; College of St. Catherine; Hamline University; Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs; Macalester College; Metropolitan State University; Minneapolis Community College; Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program; University of Minnesota (Center for Urban and Regional Affairs; Children, Youth and Family Consortium; Minnesota Extension Service); University of St. Thomas; and Minneapolis community and neighborhood representatives.

**CURA RESOURCE COLLECTION**

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs  
University of Minnesota  
330 Humphrey Center

**COORDINATING COMMUNITY-BASED  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
IN THE PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD:**

**Approaches and Challenges of the People of Phillips**

**for**

**the People of Phillips**

**prepared by Noriko Osada**

December, 1996

Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization (NPCR) supported the work of the author of this report but has not reviewed it for publication. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and is not necessarily endorsed by NPCR.

NPCR is coordinated by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota and is funded in part by an Urban Community Service Program grant administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

NPCR  
330 HHH Center  
301 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

phone: (612)625-1020  
e-mail: nelso193@maroon.tc.umn.edu

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>COMMUNITY-BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (CED).....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>THE PHILLIPS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.....	12
FOCUS ON PHILLIPS.....	13
FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES.....	13
EVALUATING THEIR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES .....	14
ASSESSING THE PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES .....	14
BUILDING PARTNERSHIP AMONG ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS IN PHILLIPS .....	15
<b>COORDINATING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN PHILLIPS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
WHY COORDINATING? .....	15
WHO ELSE IS INVOLVED?.....	16
HOW CAN THE COORDINATION BE ACCOMPLISHED? .....	17
<i>CED Clearinghouse</i> .....	17
<i>Three Types of CED Partnership</i> .....	18
<i>CED Cooperation</i> .....	18
<i>CED Coordination</i> .....	19
<i>CED Collaboration</i> .....	20
<b>ROLES OF PEOPLE OF PHILLIPS (POP) IN COORDINATING CED.....</b>	<b>21</b>
A CED RESOURCE AND EDUCATION CENTER.....	22
A CED ADVOCATE.....	22
A CED PARTNERSHIP LEADER.....	22
A CED COORDINATION FUND RAISER .....	23
<b>CHALLENGES OF POP AS A CED COORDINATOR.....</b>	<b>23</b>
DEVELOP STRONG LEADERSHIP FOR THE CED COORDINATION.....	23
DEVELOP TECHNICAL SKILLS AND EXPERIENCES OF CED.....	24
DEVELOP A VISION FOR THE PHILLIPS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY.....	24
<b>CONCLUDING REMARKS.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>26</b>

**Appendix: A survey of community-based economic development activities in Phillips**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project was supported by the Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization (NCPR) program at the University of Minnesota. The NCPR was initiated by the Center of Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) and funded by the U.S. Department of Education Urban Community Service Program. My task was to provide research assistance to People of Phillips (POP) where this project took place, an organization which is involved in the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). Many people have been extremely helpful and supportive in my completion of this project, including members of Phillips Economic Justice Committee, especially Kirk Anderson, Sam Grant, and staff at POP. I greatly appreciate inputs for the survey respondents: Brenda St. Germaine, Mary K. Crowley, Steve Cramer, Bill Schatzein, Ralph Bruins, Jim Roth, Ann Arthur, Michael Krause, and Jean Coleman. Also, I would like to acknowledge for their insights on practicing community-based economic development from Tim Mungaven, Shem Shakir, Anne Briseno, Edward B. Lambert, Curt Milburn, Kris Danielson, and Harry Jensen, during the interviews. Finally, academic advise from Margaret M. Bau and Lee Munich Jr. were also very helpful in completion of my project.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this research project is to provide the People of Phillips (POP) with (1) options for alternative organizational framework for coordinating community-based economic development (CED) in the Phillips Neighborhood and (2) literature resources on CED theories, models, and practices. The objectives include:

- to map out the Phillips economic development community;
- to search for existing CED partnership models in the Twin Cities;
- to conduct literature research on models of partnerships relevant to Phillips;
- to discuss roles and challenges of POP in the CED partnership.

The Phillips Neighborhood is one of the largest in Minneapolis with over 17,000 residents and 500 institutions. Throughout the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) planning process in 1993, over 700 residents participated in defining action plans and a vision of their future, indicating active residents' participation in their neighborhood improvement. The NRP plan includes the goal of CED that is to develop an active partnership of residents, businesses, and institutions to guide and implement CED.

Community-based economic development (CED) is the process of community participation in a local economy to influence the system so as to benefit the community. The major goals of CED include reduction of unemployment, understanding and improving a neighborhood's competitive advantages, creation of local ownership, building leadership and empowering residents, and advocating for the needs and potential development of the community. The CED activities are categorized as commercial/industrial development and property management, job development, business ownership and venture investments, business development and technical assistance, residential housing development and management, and advocacy. The CED implementation agencies are community development corporations, community cooperatives, local enterprise agencies, and employee/worker owned organizations.

The survey with the nine major non-profit organizations (American Indian Business Development Corporation, Franklin Avenue Business Association, Lake Street Council, Lake Street Partners, People of Phillips, Phillips Community Development Corporation, Project for Pride in Living, Inc., The Green Institute, and Urban Ventures) that engage in economic development activities (CED organizations) in Phillips reveals the following characteristics of the Phillips economic development community:

- Major CED activities are local business development, job placement and/or training, and commercial and/or industrial development;
- Many serve their CED activities beyond Phillips borders;
- These organizations invest a total of 28 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and \$2.5 million in Phillips during 1996. Their activities and resources are expected to increase in the near future;
- Phillips enjoys various resources available for CED: an available work force, active residents in a well-organized community, supportive businesses, a strong NRP action plan, and many

- CED organizations with long-term perspectives;
- The reality and perception of Phillips as a low income and high crime neighborhood, its capital and physical constraints, and the time-consuming and unique process of neighborhood participation are barriers for the organization to plan and execute their CED activities;
  - Forming some degree of partnership among the CED organizations is a way to more effectively and efficiently proceed their limited resources.

The coordination of economic development activities in Phillips is necessary since the neighborhood lacks an institution which exclusively engages in CED as defined by the neighborhood. CED organizations are often compelled to avoid duplication and overlap of services so as to utilize opportunities to gain economies of scale in their activities. In the CED coordination, the Phillips Economic Justice Committee (PEJC) is also an important stakeholder which represents residents regarding CED. POP occupies a unique coordinating position as (1) a neighborhood organizer to assist PEJC to effectively represent the neighborhood voice and as (2) a CED facilitator that leads efforts of the CED organizations and PEJC.

This paper presents four options for the organizational framework of the CED coordination: CED clearinghouse, CED cooperation, CED coordination, and CED collaboration. Clearinghouse activities require the least amount of power sharing of participants and resource involvement. Collaboration is at the opposite end of the organizational spectrum requiring participants to work together in problem and goal definition as well as project development, planning, implementation, and evaluation. The successful collaborative is the most powerful framework for the neighborhood and CED organizations to deal with issues without clear ownership, such as the welfare reform. It should be noted that a partnership for CED coordination can be a dynamic process. It can start as a clearinghouse and grow into a more fully collaborative relationship overtime. Or, it can take any of these forms of partnership depending on tasks the participants face and its context.

In CED, POP should assume more than just an organizer or a coordinator role. As a neighborhood organization, POP needs to play the role of CED resource and education center, and CED advocate. As a CED coordinator, it also has responsibility to be a CED partnership leader as well as a CED coordination fundraiser. Although this does not necessarily mean that POP must fulfill these roles all by itself, it has a responsibility as a neighborhood organization to seek options to realize these roles.

POP has accumulated enormous experiences and skills as a neighborhood organizer. However, POP as a CED coordinator needs to expand its capacity to deal with the process of CED to better reflect the neighborhood voice. First, POP needs to develop stronger leadership to accomplish shared community goals. Second, to be a constructive coordinator, POP must know more about CED theories, models, and practices, including the regulatory and legal process of CED projects. Third, POP, as a neighborhood organization, should develop its vision of the Phillips economic development community to realize the vision developed by the neighborhood (such as the NRP plan) so as to make consistent efforts in developing the CED partnership.

## PROJECT BACKGROUND

Residents are the experts in identifying specific needs to improve their community. Those who face problems know best what needs to be done to solve them. Residents in the Phillips Neighborhood<sup>1</sup> are not an exception. During the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) planning phase in 1993, over 700 residents participated in defining a vision of their future and the steps needed to achieve that vision. The Phillips NRP plan includes seven specific components including an American Indian plan, arts/culture/ethnicity, community-based economic development, crime and safety, housing, environment/transportation/parks, and life span. The goal of community-based economic development (CED) component is to develop an active partnership of residents, businesses, and institutions to guide and implement CED.

People of Phillips (POP), as the neighborhood association in Phillips, helped facilitate the NRP planning process and is currently under contract with the City Council to implement the plan. For the community-based economic development component, POP assisted neighborhood residents, business personnel, and local development institutions to create the Phillips Economic Justice Committee (PEJC), where people discuss options and strategies to implement the NRP plan and to coordinate economic development projects and programs that are currently implemented or planned within Phillips. PEJC is one of the standing committees of the Neighborhood Congress, the governing body of POP. So far, PEJC defined its mission, goals, and guidelines for community-based economic development practices. Presently, nine major non-profit organizations engage in economic development activities within Phillips, although few of them serve the Phillips Neighborhood exclusively. Thus, POP and PEJC also seek ways to cooperate with these non-profit organizations in planning and implementing comprehensive community-based economic development in Phillips. To be more effectively involved in the process of community-based economic development, POP and PEJC needed to find options for coordinating community-based economic development as well as information on economic development planning and implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Phillips is the neighborhood surrounded by Highway I-94 on the north, 35W on the east, East Lake Street on the south, and Hiawatha Avenue on the west side. It is the largest neighborhood in Minneapolis with a population of over 17,000.



## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The primary goals of this research project were (1) to provide options for alternative organizational framework for coordinating community-based economic development within Phillips, and (2) to compile information on community-based economic development theories, models, and practices. Tasks to accomplish these goals included:

- to conduct a survey of nine major economic development institutions that implement projects and programs within Phillips;
- to hold the first round table where executive directors of these institutions discuss the possibility for partnership on community-based economic development activities in Phillips;
- to interview community-based economic development practitioners in the Twin Cities area regarding their practice and perspectives on community-based economic development;
- to research literature on community-based economic development theories, models, and practices and to hold several study groups to review the research findings with POP staff and PEJC members.

Although the ultimate goal of the project was to offer options for coordinating Phillips community-based economic development, the research started with two fundamental questions; What is community-based economic development? And what is the Phillips economic development community?

## **COMMUNITY-BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (CED)**

Neighborhood organizations, specialized in organizing, started engaging in development activities in the mid-1960s when the Ford Foundation encouraged the creation of community development corporations and also the federal government implemented the Model Cities and Anti-Poverty Programs (Kolodny, 1985; Lemnn). Neighborhood organizations were frustrated with the limitation of simply organizing for veto power and felt that (1) no effective revitalization occurs without their direct involvement in development activities, (2) they need to ensure that the revitalization efforts meet the community's needs and are of maximum benefit, and (3) they need to build indigenous know-how on economic development and locally owned housing and businesses (Kolodny, 1985). Economic development activities here are defined as direct involvement in creating housing, employment, and local businesses, along with other economic

development related activities.

CED can also be seen as an alternative to traditional economic development approaches. The conventional economic growth model focuses on competition, productivity, and efficiency within the market-driven economy of mass production and consumption. However, this model has increased the disparity between rich and poor. Wealth did not trickle down. Governments' top-down development policies based on an economic growth model hardly ever met the basic needs of the poor. Thus, the bottom-up development approach, or economic development at the community level, has gained attention of government officials, development scholars, and development organizations as an anti-poverty program.

Most economic development activities initiated by government agencies target broader regions than neighborhoods. Therefore, neighborhoods do not participate in the planning process or all are not benefited from the regional economic improvements. Thus, participation of neighborhood-based organizations is critical to ensure that benefits of economic development activities accrue to their neighborhoods (Mazaraki, 1993).

Community-based economic development (CED) can be defined as:

a process that *a community*, as a group of people who know each other personally and who can plan together over time for their long-term common improvement, participates in *an economy*, as a system of human activity directed to meeting human needs and wants that are determined by deliberate allocations of scarce resources, by *development*, as deliberately changing the economic system to benefit the community (Boothroy and Davis, 1993).

Eric Shragge (1993) argues further that CED includes social and economic development, mobilization and advocacy for social change, and building of alternative community institutions. If CED is to improve the quality of life, especially that of the most disadvantaged, its approach needs to include their *empowerment*<sup>2</sup>. CED is community participation in the capitalist system

---

<sup>2</sup> Empowerment is a process that involves changing power relations between individuals and groups and social institutions, at a personal and at a political level. It is also a process of personnel change as individuals take action on their own behalf and then redefine their understanding of the world in which they live. From victim to agent, people are able to act in a political and social arena and pursue their own interest (Shargge, 1993).

determined by the needs of the local community. The role of CED is to build both economic activities and a voice for the local community to have greater control over wider economic and social processes (Shragge, 1993).

The major goals of CED are:

- to reduce unemployment;
- to identify and enhance the competitive advantage of a community;
- to create opportunities for local ownership or control;
- to build leadership and empower community residents;
- to address gaps in perception, education, and information that economically disadvantaged communities are worth the effort of economic and social investment (Mazaraski, 1993).

CED activities to accomplish these goals are categorized as follows (Mazaraski, 1993):

1. ***Commercial/industrial development & property management:*** real estate development, including office developments, site assemblage for an industrial park or shopping center, creating a shared facility or incubator, and management of these facilities;
2. ***Worker development:*** job placement and referrals, job training and skill development, etc.
3. ***Business ownership and venture investments:*** operation of market-driven businesses, including retail, furniture maker, bakery, and recycling plant. Some of these take different ownership forms: workers cooperatives or employee stock ownership plans;
4. ***Business development and technical assistance:*** technical assistance and matchmaking services for start-ups, and small- and medium-sized businesses;
5. ***Residential housing development and management:*** the most popular and successful activity initiated by neighborhood organizations, including community development corporations;
6. ***Advocacy:*** advocates for neighborhood residents to effect infrastructure improvements, create business incentives, foreign trade, or enterprise zones, influence first source hiring agreements, or lobby for and implement corporate retention strategies. The advocacy role is often integrated into all activities mentioned the above.

Then, who plans and implements these activities on behalf of the community? With focus on community ownership, there are five organizational forms for CED: Community development corporation (CDC), Community cooperative, Local enterprise agency, Employee/worker

ownership, and Community employment and training board (Blakely, 1994):

- **Community development corporation (CDC)** is, in general, a non-profit organization controlled by residents of low- or middle-income areas to help stimulate economic and physical improvement of the community. CDCs, started as a part of the War on Poverty in the mid-1960s, now implements various economic development projects and programs according to community's priorities within the constraints of market feasibility. CDCs are generally equipped with full-time technical staffs and have some degree of planning capacity, although some heavily depend on resident volunteers;
- **Community cooperative** is a business owned and managed by a group of workers in a community. In such a cooperative, the group shares the responsibility and liability for generating wealth and/or employment using jointly held resources. This is often established when a business owner decides to sell to a community due to the lack of private investors' interest, when a community service (such as child care and elderly care) require delivery, and when a group of unemployed but skilled people form an organization to sell their services and products collectively for community benefits;
- **Local enterprise agency (LEA)** is an organization dedicated to the creation of employment by supporting and developing indigenous local enterprises. LEA provides an intermediary link between public and private institutions and the community. It is generally formed as a coalition of local business unions, government, and community-based organizations;
- **Employee/worker ownership** is an organizational form in which workers and a community try to resuscitate a declining company by owning and managing it by themselves. Two forms, stock ownership and worker cooperatives, are well-known examples;
- **Community employment and training board** is a function involving training institutions, community-based organizations, and employers to alter human resource systems to increase opportunities for good jobs for the unemployed and the underemployed in the community. The methods include customized training, target placement, and a local employment program.

## THE PHILLIPS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY

In order to coordinate economic development activities within Phillips, POP and PEJC need to learn what economic development activities are presently planned and initiated by who with what and how much resources in Phillips. As mentioned, there are nine major non-profit organizations that initiate in planning and/or implementing economic development projects and/or programs within Phillips: Phillips Community Development Corporation (PCDC), American Indian Business

Development Corporation (AIBDC), Project for Pride in Living Inc. (PPL), Lake Street Council, Urban Ventures, Lake Street Partners, The Green Institute, Franklin Avenue Business Association (FABA), and POP. Even though they have known each other through various meetings, little data and information on their activities and resources related to economic development in Phillips have been available. Thus, the survey was conducted to assess the Phillips economic development community. Based on the survey, PEJC and POP sponsored a roundtable where these organizations discussed coordinating efforts on community-based economic development in Phillips.

The questionnaire of 16 questions asked executive directors about economic development activities of their organizations; the degree of their focus in Phillips; financial and human resources engaged in these activities; and strengths and weaknesses of their activities and the Phillips economic development community. Despite its short notice, all responded to the survey, indicating their strong interests in mapping out community-based economic development in Phillips. The complete survey result is listed in Appendix 1.

### ***Economic Development Activities***

Many organizations engage in business development and provide job placement and/or training services. PCDC, AIBDC, PPL, Urban Ventures, Lake St. Council, and the Green Institute offer technical and/or financial support programs for small business start-ups and entrepreneurs. These organizations except for PCDC and Lake St. Partners, engage in commercial or industrial development. PCDC and Urban Ventures also have a microloan program. PPL and the Green Institute engage in residential housing development as well. PCDC, PPL, Urban Ventures, and the Green Institute provide job seekers with job skill training, job counseling, job placement and referral services. POP predominantly organizes focus groups, workshops, and plan development related economic development activities in Phillips. FABA focuses on land use and networking opportunities for business owners and conducting studies on revitalization of Franklin Avenue. The Green Institute especially emphasizes environmentally sound economic development in each of their activities. Most organizations expect an increase in economic development activities in the next 5 years.

### ***Focus on Phillips***

Three organizations, AIBDC, POP, and FABA, exclusively target their services to the Phillips Neighborhood. AIBDC engages in commercial and business development on a specific site in Phillips. FABA limits its membership to businesses along East Franklin Avenue in Phillips and POP is the neighborhood association. Although PCDC serves the South Minneapolis area, 75% of their clients live from Phillips. The Green Institute executes 75% of their activities in Phillips. Lake St. Partners and Lake St. Council apparently focus along East Lake street so that both implement 50% of their activities in Phillips. Urban Ventures, located near Phillips, also puts 50% of their economic development efforts into Phillips. Since PPL's target population is throughout the Twin Cities area, about 25% of their projects take place in Phillips.

### ***Financial and Human Resources***

These organizations currently allocate a total of 45 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and a total 1996 budget of \$6.24 million to their community-based economic development activities. Adjusting their focus on Phillips, they put 28 FTE staff and \$1.6 million into the Phillips Neighborhood<sup>3</sup>. For economic development staff for Phillips, 15 people, or more than 50%, work at the Green Institute followed by AIBDC and PPL, 3 FTE staff each. Regarding the budget on economic development in Phillips, the Green Institute invests \$450,000 or 28%, AIBDC and Urban Ventures \$300,000 or 19%, and Lake St. Partners \$200,000 or 12%. Urban Ventures, AIBDC, and Lake St. Partners have large budgets relative to the number of the FTE staff since they engage in more capital intensive economic development activities. The details are shown in Table 1.

For their funding resources, all but FABA get financial support from private foundations. Eight organizations, all except for Lake St. Council and Urban Ventures, also receive funding from government agencies. Five of them acquire money from the NRP budget as well. PCDC, AIBDC, Urban Ventures, Lake St. Council, and the Green Institute also finance their operations with individual and corporate revenues from their services.

---

<sup>3</sup> 28 FTE staff is the summation of "FTE staff for CED \* focus on Phillips (%)" of each organization. Likewise, \$2.5 million is the summation of "CED budget in 1996 \* focus on Phillips (%)" of each organization.

Table 1: Financial and Human Resource Allocated to CED in Phillips, 1996

Organization	FTE Staff		Budget (\$ *1000)	
PCDC	1.5	5%	\$ 150	9%
AIBDC	3	11%	\$ 300	19%
PPL	3	11%	\$ 100	6%
Lake St. Partners	0.5	2%	\$ 200	12%
Urban Venture	2.3	8%	\$ 300	19%
People of Phillips	1.8	6%	\$ 55	3%
Lake St. Council	0.7	3%	\$ 32.50	2%
The Green Institute	15	54%	\$ 450	28%
FABA	0.3	1%	\$ 20	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 1,607.50</b>	<b>100%</b>

### ***Evaluating Their Economic Development Activities***

The organizations self-evaluated their activities related to economic development in somewhat similar ways. All but PCDC mentioned their established organizational capacity: organizing and negotiation skills, a network of supportive stakeholders, competent leadership, and thorough understanding of neighborhoods, as their strengths. Only PCDC and PPL pointed out their technical capacity. PCDC raised their accumulated technical expertise in operating technical and local programs and providing job placement services. PPL developed their strengths in property management and marketing. As weaknesses, many raised lack of stable financial and/or human resources to meet increasing demand for their services and activities. Urban Ventures pointed out their lack of time attending neighborhood meeting as their weakness.

### ***Assessing the Phillips Neighborhood for Economic Development Activities***

The Phillips Neighborhood has various resources: work force, active residents and a well-organized community, supportive businesses, a strong NRP action plan, and many economic development agencies with long-term interests. It has also developed experiences in housing development and job creation. On the other hand, the reality and perception of Phillips as a low income and high crime area, its capital and physical constraints, and the time-consuming and



unique process of neighborhood participation create difficulties for the organization to provide the quality services and/or effectively proceed with projects in Phillips. Moreover, many organizations responded that absence of coordination and collaboration among themselves and/or with government and other private agencies limit comprehensive economic development.

### ***Building Partnership among Economic Development Organizations in Phillips***

The survey indicated the need for creating partnership among organizations that engage in community-based economic development in Phillips to overcome human and financial constraints and to avoid duplication. PEJC and POP hosted the first roundtable on coordinating efforts for community-based economic development in Phillips. All survey participants were present at the round table discussion.

The discussion was focused on needs and implications to partnership, possible models for collaboration and the expected outcome of the partnership. Many recognized the need to form partnerships so as to share limited financial and human resources to achieve more than what an individual organizations can. However, it was difficult to create a partnership without identifying issues for which they need to work together. Also, expected outcomes of the possible partnership were unclear; an effective partnership needs a unique agenda which is worthy of organizations' participation. The participants agreed that the partnership should be more than a place for exchanging information. At the end of the round table, a subcommittee was created to come up with possible models of community-based economic development partnerships. Later on, the subcommittee was held and proposed to form a partnership by working together to anticipate and prepare for the impact of welfare reform on the Phillips Neighborhood. The subcommittee is currently planning to hold a second round table where information on welfare reform will be exchanged and the actual plan will be created.

## **COORDINATING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN PHILLIPS**

### ***Why Coordinating?***

Coordination of planning and implementing economic development activities in Phillips is of



mutual interest to Phillips and the agencies engaging in development activities in the neighborhood. As mentioned before, Phillips presently lacks a neighborhood-based organization which specializes in implementation of economic development projects created by residents. Instead, it has nine community-based economic development (CED) organizations carrying out various development projects and services with missions to help lower income areas. Unless Phillips is willing to create a new Community Development Corporation exclusively for the neighborhood, some sort of partnership with these organizations, including other external development agencies, is crucial to realize a comprehensive development plan like the NRP action plan.

As also shown in the survey, the CED organizations claim that financial and human resource constraints force them to make more efforts in reducing duplication and overlap of services and projects; the agencies must be aware of each other's agenda and activities. Thus, they can invest their limited resources more efficiently and effectively to better meet needs of their service area. Partnership among the organizations will further make it possible for them to exploit economies of scale. By planning and implementing projects or providing services on a larger scale, efforts should result in larger impacts on targeted populations.

Moreover, partnership plus active neighborhood participation often helps these CED organizations gain flexible and long-term funding from foundations. Interviews with CED practitioners in the Twin Cities indicated that foundations are more willing to fund projects planned with neighborhood participation and implemented by collaboration with organizations of related interests.

### ***Who Else Is Involved?***

It is by now apparent that these nine CED organizations and other developers are the implementation agencies of economic development plans in Phillips. Besides them, Phillips residents and the Phillips Economic Justice Committee (PEJC) are important stakeholders for the coordination of CED activities in Phillips. Phillips residents are the ones who identify needs and problems that CED organizations are trying to solve as well as the ones who face the

consequences that the coordination will bring about. PEJC is the committee which represents and advocates for the interests and concerns of the residents to the CED organizations. The committee also makes sure that coordination of the CED activities will not only enhance the capacity of the CED organizations but will better benefit the neighborhood using its mission, goals, and guidelines.

Even though included as one of the nine CED organizations, POP plays a unique role as an organizer rather than an implementation agent of the CED activities. As a neighborhood organizer, POP assists PEJC to effectively represent the voice of Phillips residents. As a CED coordinator, it facilitates the coordination among the CED implementation organizations with neighborhood participation represented by PEJC.

### ***How Can the Coordination Be Accomplished?***

The stakeholders, that is, PEJC, Phillips residents, the CED organizations, and POP, need to establish an organizational framework where economic development activities in Phillips are proposed, planned, coordinated, and evaluated for the neighborhood. This section will present four options: a clearinghouse, cooperation, coordination, and collaboration, and their pros and cons.

#### ***CED Clearinghouse***

One framework is to create a CED clearinghouse where various agencies exchange information, and technical, human, and financial resources related to CED and then matched them up into CED implementation plans. PEJC with assistance of POP will identify needs and problems of the neighborhood and guide planning and implementation of the development projects toward the benefit of the neighborhood. POP will manage the clearinghouse, negotiate with state agencies, create project-based contracts with PEJC and the CED organizations, and evaluate the progress and outcomes of the projects. In this framework, the CED organizations remain as subcontractors of the projects proposed by the neighborhood.

The clearinghouse is relatively easy and the least costly to establish and manage among the four options. It is a very loose framework where organizations can come in and go out on their

convenience. Thus, the influence of PEJC on the CED organizations is minimal in this framework. Although the clearinghouse is a place more suitable for piecemeal coordination, it can be a starting point to develop a reliable relationship among the CED implementation organizations, PEJC, and POP leading to partnership for comprehensive economic development in Phillips.

### ***Three Types of CED Partnership***

The other framework involves more active participation of the CED implementation organizations in the planning process by creating partnership. Various types of existing partnerships can be categorized into three options based on degree of resource involvement and power sharing: *cooperation*, *coordination*, and *collaboration* (Hubbard, 1995).

#### ***CED Cooperation***

Cooperation is the form where agencies voluntarily contribute their resources to assist other agencies. Power sharing in implementation of activities of partners is very limited. At least one lead agency is responsible for implementing a specific development project, in consideration with PEJC to reflect the voice of residents. Sharing information, including the CED activities of the agencies, will take place through informal and/or formal meetings organized by POP. Other partners will help it accomplish the project by contributing financial and/or material resources.

Cooperation can have a somewhat stronger influence than the clearinghouse to persuade stakeholders to work together through meetings where all can meet at once. It requires time commitments from the CED implementation organizations to show up at the meetings. It will not take much financial resources and may create many conflicts among partners to establish cooperation since the relationship is still loose and volunteer-based. However, as the first round table indicated, maintaining cooperation, or the organizations' constant participation in the meetings, will need stronger incentives than exchanging information, such as external or internal influential guest speakers. This will be arranged by POP based on the inputs from the CED organizations and PEJC. Again, this can be a good place to start building up a partnership for community-based economic development in Phillips.

### *CED Coordination*

Coordination is the form where agencies organize or combine their respective resources in order to more effectively achieve an existing common goal which cannot be achieved by a single agency.

More power sharing is involved but each partner controls its activities (Hubbard, 1995). The focus of the CED coordination will be to improve how development activities of each agency fit together to revitalize the Phillips Neighborhood, not to make changes in the substance of individual development programs. The CED coordination can take two forms: *a joint project* and *an ongoing partnership in reconciling activities*.

*A joint project* is the coordination based on a relatively large-scale, and often short-term, project. Needs and project goals will be defined by PEJC based on the NRP plan and budget. POP will facilitate the process of partners bringing resources and working jointly to produce an outcome by participating in the planning, implementation, and evaluation. The implementation process will be based on coordinating the current activities of each partner. Resources required also include time, energy, and expertise of staff, in addition to financial and material offerings. If possible, POP will also coordinate the cost of common goods or services which can be shared by partners to exploit economies of scale. An example of a joint project is a possible form of partnership for a response to welfare reform.

*Reconciling activities* mean that agencies adjust or combine the delivery of existing programs in order to increase their effectiveness (Hubbard, 1995). These activities include (1) reducing duplication or overlap of development activities and services, (2) making overall economic development in Phillips more accountable to the residents and other stakeholders, and (3) improving the impact of their activities through offering a more integrated response to identified needs for CED. Efforts to reconcile activities usually require ongoing relationships among partners, which will be facilitated by POP.

Coordination takes more time and commitment from each partner than cooperation since it is a stronger relationship in terms of power sharing. It may be difficult for them to compromise their current activities, by changing a focus of the current activities or the target population, in order to

accomplish a joint project or improve the effectiveness of their services all together. Deciding how each organization will compromise which activities can be a time consuming process requiring a great amount of energy from all participants.

### ***CED Collaboration***

Collaboration is the organizational model where agencies develop a new and shared agenda to direct their activities to solve problems which lack clear ownership or large-scale problems beyond the reach of individual agencies (Hubbard, 1995). It is a common response to conditions of uncertainty, such as welfare reform. The CED collaboration can take two forms: *collective planning* and *a new CED model or a collaborative organization*.

*Collective planning* is the process where CED agencies try to develop a shared understanding of a problem or a collective vision for action in order to accomplish greater coordination of their current and future activities. POP will organize a forum where CED agencies will learn needs and collective visions for action raised by PEJC and Phillips residents and then create action plans for implementation. The agencies will coordinate their activities in order to implement the action plans.

Moreover, collaborative planning can go further to create *a new system of development activities* or *a virtual organization* that addresses the problems of the neighborhood: a Phillips CED collaborative. In the collaborative, each agency, although maintaining its separate identity, will equally participate in decision making and share responsibilities for planning and implementation of the agreed development plan. In the case of developing a response to welfare reform, POP will coordinate such a collaborative of the CED agencies and PEJC. In the process of learning the neighborhood inputs and information related to welfare reform gathered by the agencies, the collaborative identifies needs and problems, its objectives, tasks, and required resources to respond to the expected consequences of welfare reform.

Successful collaboration is a powerful framework for a group of committed organizations to produce large-scale accomplishments. PEJC and Phillips residents can be most effectively involved in the process of creating common goals and objectives or a new system more responsive

to needs of the neighborhood. Moreover, a collaborative can apply for funding as an organization rather than depend on contributions from each participant. On the other hand, the collaboration requires the highest degree of power sharing and resource involvement among the options described here. It is a very time consuming process and thus not suitable for problems which need quick response and decisive action. There should exist little power inequality among participants. POP needs to act as collaborative leader in guiding and coordinating the process of the collaboration.

One common concern in establishing any type of CED partnership is how much the neighborhood can control the CED activities within Phillips. The NRP grant for community-based economic development is about \$4.4 million from 1995 to 1999.<sup>4</sup> This is less than half of what the nine CED implementation organizations invest in Phillips in 1996. Moreover, the neighborhood still has to raise another \$9.5 million to match the grant in order to implement the plan.<sup>5</sup> It is unknown if the NRP grant is a strong incentive for CED implementation agencies to recognize PEJC as representing the neighborhood as their equal partner and/or to become more committed to participate in CED coordination.

## **ROLES OF PEOPLE OF PHILLIPS (POP) IN COORDINATING CED**

As a neighborhood organizer and a coordinator of the Phillips economic development community, POP needs to play several important roles regardless of the organizational framework for coordinating economic development in Phillips. These roles include an education and resource center of community-based economic development (CED), an advocate of the neighborhood's needs and interests for CED with PEJC, a leader of the CED partnership, and a fund raiser of the planning process of the CED projects/programs.

---

4 NRP Policy Board Recommendation 1995-1999 People of Phillips Action Plan Funding Sources (Final draft, 1995).

5 NRP Policy Board Recommendation 1995-1999 People of Phillips Action Plan Funding Sources (Final draft, 1995).

### ***A CED Resource and Education Center***

The mission of POP, "to develop a sense of community, encourage widespread citizen participation in all decision making processes affecting the community, provide the mechanism for residents to be well informed, and facilitate improvement of the physical, social, and cultural environment of the Phillips Neighborhood," dictates its responsibility to assist Phillips residents to become better decision makers in neighborhood issues, including economic development. As a resource center, POP will provide residents access to information related to (1) general economic development theories and practices, (2) regulatory and legal procedures of economic development, (3) how to develop and maintain relationships with government agencies, and (4) follow up progress in development activities within Phillips. As an educator, POP will offer workshops and study groups where together people can learn about issues related community-based economic development. It will also publish newsletters to disseminate information. POP is currently developing the CED education program including these tasks and planning to apply for funding.

### ***A CED Advocate***

As a community organizer, POP assists PEJC to effectively represent the voice of the neighborhood regarding economic development. However, PEJC members are volunteers and have limitations on their contribution of time and energy to actively participate in the CED process. Thus the PEJC Coordinator, a paid POP staff, needs to fulfill the gap and act as an advocate for decisions made by PEJC and Phillips residents. The Coordinator will also evaluate the CED activities according to the guidelines PEJC has developed.

### ***A CED Partnership Leader***

The role POP plays in CED coordination is as a CED partnership coordinator. In the survey, the POP Executive Director responded that the current activities of POP related to CED is to organize meetings, focus groups, and develop plans. The accumulated experience and skills in identifying needs and organizing meetings to develop strategies for implementation will qualify POP for the role of coordinator better than anyone else.

### ***A CED Coordination Fund Raiser***

The Phillips neighborhood has to raise \$ 4.4 million to match the NRP grants of \$1.2 million for community-based economic development finalized by the NRP implementation plan for 1997 to 1999. Although raising the matching funds by POP itself is at present beyond its capacity, POP, as the contracted NRP implementation agency, needs to coordinate and plan how and by whom it can be raised. At least, as the CED partnership coordinator, it will have to secure funding to establish and manage the partnership by itself. POP has already raised funding to set up PEJC and discuss implementation for the CED component of the NRP action plan.

### **CHALLENGES OF POP AS A CED COORDINATOR**

As the previous section described, POP has to play a role as the coordinator of the CED partnership as well as an acting representative of the neighborhood. Although POP has extensive experience and skills in both roles as a neighborhood organizer, the process of community-based economic development requires of POP stronger leadership skills related to development than organizing. Community-based economic development starts with neighborhood organizing: the residents decide what they want to do to improve their community (The CED Practitioners, 1996). However, CED requires more than organizing skills and knowledge; it requires strong leadership, CED technical skills, and a vision for the Phillips economic development community. These are major challenges for POP to serve as a successful CED coordinator.

### ***Develop Strong Leadership for the CED Coordination***

The CED coordinator is not just a coordinator but also a leader of the CED partnership. Strong leadership here does not mean the traditional, hierarchical, political, and confrontational models of leadership. Rather, an effective leader for the partnership needs to be able to *guide* as well as coordinate the decision-making process. The groups as a whole must be self-governing and all participants be equally represented in the making of joint decisions (London, 1995). It requires a clear vision of community-based leadership, skills, and actions to help communities and organizations realize their visions, solve problems, and get results. The economic development



chapter of the NRP action plan can be used as the vision of POP as the CED leader.

The participatory decision making process in partnership is time-consuming and a place to create or reveal conflicts among partners. Without strong leadership, such prolonged conflicts of interest can fail to maintain the active relationship. In addition to encouraging participation and facilitating the process, POP, as the partnership leader, needs to direct the discussion process toward the goals which the partnership was established for. Unlike an organizer, POP should be more active in suggesting directions that the partnership should take. As observed in the first round table, participants without distinct leadership tend not to produce tangible consensus but to rely on someone else, such as a subcommittee, for crucial decision making.

### ***Develop Technical Skills and Experiences of CED***

POP has been successful at indirectly engaging in CED activities by assisting to establish new CED organizations, such as the Green Institute, the Housing Resource Clearinghouse for Phillips, the Phillips Credit Union, and the Youth Enterprise Center. However, POP is not an active direct agent of CED since it is not running these organizations except for the Youth Enterprise Center. Technical skills required for development is different from that of organizing; market analysis, and development, planning, implementation, and evaluation of specific projects. As a CED coordinator, POP needs to be aware of technical issues and implications in the process of CED so that it can better follow up the progress of CED activities and negotiate with the CED organizations and government development agencies in favor of the Phillips neighborhood. The CED education program under development will provide POP staff with opportunities to learn CED. Also, POP should identify and have reliable volunteers and/or paid consultants available for advice regarding CED related technical issues (The CED Practitioners, 1996).

### ***Develop a Vision for the Phillips Economic Development Community***

Finally, POP, as the only CED organization which defines the entire Phillips neighborhood as the target population and as the CED coordinator, needs to develop a long-term vision for the Phillips economic development community. By constantly dealing with neighborhood issues as professionals, all POP staff should be able to identify needs and issues of the neighborhood from

different perspectives of the residents. As stated before, community organizing is a part of community-based economic development. Thus, all organizers should participate in creating the CED vision; what kind of an economic development community is needed by Phillips? How can POP play a role to realize it? The vision will facilitate the establishment of a framework of the CED partnership and help new POP staff understand what the organization regards as community-based economic development in the context of Phillips.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Coordinating community-based economic development by creating a long-term partnership among nine organizations is a great challenge that no one seems to have ever dealt with before. The potential partners will have to struggle together to create a suitable structure by themselves. Major roles of POP in this process are (1) to support the PEJC to represent the neighborhood's decisions, (2) to coordinate and guide the partnership, and (3) to increase its capacity for development while maintaining that for organizing. These are challenges for POP which cannot be overcome overnight, but need to be addressed ahead of the partnership building process.

## RESOURCES

Boothroyd, Peter and H. Craig Davis. (1993) "Community Economic Development: Three Approaches," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 1993. vol.12:230-240.

CDRC (1993) *More than Housing: How CDC go about Changing Lives and Neighborhoods*. Community Development Research Center.

Florin, Paul. (1989) *Nurturing the Grassroots: Neighborhood Volunteer Organizations & America's Cities*. Citizens Committee for New York City, Inc.

Habburd, Betsy. (1995) "Making Sense of Public Service Partnerships: Understanding the Why & How of Interagency Efforts". *Plan B Paper*. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

Kolodny, Robert. (1985) *Organizing for Neighborhood Development: A Handbook for Citizen Groups*. Center for Community Change. Washington, D.C.

Lemann, Nicholas. (1994) "The Myth of Community Development."

Liwin Janice et. al. (1994) "Effective Community Development," *SHELTERFORCE*, July/August 1994.

London, Scott. (1995) "Building Collaborative Communities." (Literature review on issues of collaboration prepared for Pew Partnership for Civic Change.)

Mazarakis, Helen. (1993) *Community Economic Development: A Study of Economic Development Activities Within the Community*. Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Okazaki, Alan. (1995) *Building Community of Opportunity: New Development Options for the Northwest and Upper Midwest*. The Northwest Area Foundation.

Shragge, Eric. (1993) *Community Economic Development*. Black Rose Books, New York.

Stoecker, Randy. (1996) "Empowering Redevelopment: Toward a Different CDC," *SHELTERFORCE*, May/June 1996.

The CED practitioners. (1996) *Interviews with the CED practitioners in the Twin Cities*.

Wandersman, Abraham. (1993) *Understanding Coalitions and How They Operate: An "Open Systems" Organizational Perspective*. A summary of literature prepared for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation Community-Based Public Health Initiative.

Vidal, Avis. (1992) *Rebuilding Communities*. Community Development Research Center, Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, N.Y.

## APPENDIX: A survey of community-based economic development activities in Phillips

Dear Friend,



During the past few years you have helped draft, lobby and implement the NRP Community Economic Development chapter. You, along with people at your agency, either inherited or figured out what to do with the NRP. What we collectively came up with was a nine point program, much of which is being implemented.

At the beginning of the discussions, in the middle of drafting the plan, and now, a year into the NRP program, we have repeatedly wondered:

WHERE IS THE HOME FOR A PHILLIPS COMMUNITY BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ENTITY WITH A VALUE ON SUSTAINABILITY & THE CAPACITY TO TURN VISION INTO PRAGMATIC REALITY?

in other words:

Wanted: A partner to dance the nitty gritty tune of bricks and mortar with an influencial dreamer!

Or it goes like this: is there a need for a comprehensive overall agency to coordinate and implement the economic desires of Phillips? Or, it goes around and around and yes, people agree again and again on a need for a Phillips Chamber of Commerce to attend to marketing, business retention and recruitment, or land use. Or, people agreed to the need for a coordinated effort to incubate and develop ideas such as the Phillips Credit Union, or Lake Street or Franklin Avenue revitalization or the GREEN Institute, or the Phillips Small Business Resource Center. There is agreement that such efforts would be beneficial to each of us and yet not one of us, (and this means the agencies that provide community based economic development, POP, PCDC, PPL, AIBDC, FABA, Lake Street, GREEN Institute, Urban Ventures) wants to house the effort.

So, it is time to come together again and think this through. The Phillips Economic Justice Committee at POP is vested with the responsibility to get us through this puzzle. The Committee will sponsor a Round Table. October 23, ~~Tuesday~~ <sup>Wed.</sup>, from 10 - 12, place, to be announced. We will provide bagels.

In order to prepare for the Round Table, our intern, Noriko Osada, wrote a survey asking Executive Directors of community economic development agencies to help us map out the current economic development climate, the challenges and opportunities in Phillips. The survey results will be presented at the Round Table in order to have profitable discussion on the future of the Phillips economic developmment. Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire as soon as possilbe and send (or fax it at 874-7605) to People of Phillips by iMonday, Occtober 21. Ms Osada will be calling you to inform you about the Round Table soon. Thank you very much for your contribution.

Sincerely,  
Sharon Jaffe  
NRP Implementation Coordinator

Phillips Economic Justice Committee

Questionnaire for assessing Community-based Economic Development Activities  
October, 1996

There are 16 questions with 4 pages.

Please skip the questions which do not apply to the nature of your organization.  
The result of this survey will be summarized and presented at the Roundtable on October 23.

Organization name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's name: \_\_\_\_\_ Position: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1. Please state the mission of your organization, or include the brochure describing the mission.**

---

---

---

**Q2. What community-based economic development activities have been initiated by your organization?**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing rehab                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> New housing construction          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing deconstruction                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Financing for homebuyers          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Job skill training                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Job placement and referral        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Job counseling/work readiness                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial/industrial development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financing commercial/industrial development    |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct support services for business           | <input type="checkbox"/> Land use                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Referrals to support services for businesses   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Micro-loans (\$10,000 and under) to businesses |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Support programs for startups/entrepreneurs    |  |

☐ Others: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Others: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Others: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q3. Have you done these activities alone or with other organizations?**

☐ By yourself

☐ With other organizations

→ Please list the name of those organizations and describe the activities.

---

---

---

**Q4. What percentage of these activities take place WITHIN the Phillips Neighborhood?**

• Housing:

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Jobs / employment:

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Land use:

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Local business supports:

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Business support / development:

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Other activities: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

• Other activities: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ 100 % (all activities) ☐ 75 % ☐ 50% ☐ 25% ☐ Less than 25%

**Q5. How many of your staff are directly working on these economic based development activities?**

\_\_\_\_\_ FTE staff

**Q6. How much staff time do you think will be devoted to economic development activities in your organization during 1997?**

\_\_\_\_\_ FTE Staff

**Q7. Approximately how much funding in total did your organization raise to execute these activities in 1996?**

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Q8. About how much funding will your organization have to undertake its economic development work in 1997?**

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Q9. What are your major sources of funding?**

- ☐ Federal government
- ☐ State government
- ☐ County/City government (other than NRP)
- ☐ NRP
- ☐ Private foundations
- ☐ Individual/corporate revenues
- ☐ Others: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of your organization when engaging in community based economic development activities?**

**Strength:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Weaknesses:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q11. How do you think your organization can overcome the weaknesses?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q12. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Phillips Neighborhood when your organization executes community based economic development projects?**

**Strengths:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Weaknesses:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



**Q13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Phillips economic development community?**

**Strength:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Weaknesses:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q14. How do you think those weaknesses can be improved?**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q15. How do you see the role of your organization as it relates to the Phillips neighborhood? Is this role different than the role you see for organization overall?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

Please explain why:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q16. Is your organization planning to increase your volume of current services and/or activities in the next 5 years?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

**Thank you for your time and contribution!**

**Please FAX this back to People of Phillips at (612) 874-7605**

**by MONDAY, OCTOBER, 21.**

**Or, please call Noriko Osada at 874-1711 to pick it up at your office.**

<i>Name, organization</i>	<i>Mission</i>	<i>Cooperation with other organizations</i>	<i>FTE staff for CED</i>	<i>FTE staff for CED in 1997</i>	<i>Budget for CED in 1996</i>	<i>Budget for CED in 1997</i>
<b>Mary K. Crowley, PCDC</b>	To promote neighborhood improvement and economic revitalization and to assist residents in becoming self sufficient through employment opportunities	Job fairs with Phillips agencies, Credit union with POP and others, Funding businesses with AIBDC & PPL	2	2	\$200,000	\$350,000
<b>Brenda St. Germaine, AIBDC</b>	To create jobs and promote business development in the Phillips Neighborhood	By myself	3	3	\$300,000	\$300,000
<b>Steve Cramer, PPL</b>			12	6	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
<b>Bill Schatzlein, Lake St. Project</b>	Physical, social, and economic revitalization of the Lake street corridor. The creation of living wage jobs for neighborhood residents	Funds for business from NRP with Powderhorn Park Neighborhood association, Business assistance & recruitment with Lake St. Council	1	1	\$400,000	\$300,000
<b>Ralph Bruins, Urban Venture</b>		By myself & CINA, POP, PPL, MPLS Cons. Community Development, Churches, Economic development, family & youth programs	4.5	4	\$600,000	\$ 2,000,000
<b>Donn Vargas, People of Phillips</b>	To provide an opportunity for citizen participation in local government affairs as well as make recommendations to the city of MPLS on residential or commercial development projects	PCDC, Hen. County, PPL, City of MPLS and others	1.8	2	\$55,000	\$100,000
<b>Jim Roth, Resource, Inc.</b>	To enable people with disabilities, people who are disadvantaged, and people in transition to achieve greater social and economic independence	Job training with AIOIC & AIC	0	0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ann Arthur, Lake St. Council</b>	To champion the economic and civic vitality of Lake street on the betterment of our community.	Lake Street Project, Urban venture, etc.	1.4	1.4	\$65,000	\$65,000
<b>Michael Krause, The Green Institute</b>	To protect and nurture our natural and urban environment through education and sustainable economic development	PCDC, AIOIC, MCDA	20	18	\$600,000	\$ 1,100,000
<b>Jean Coleman, FABA</b>	To strengthen business,	POP for transit and street scope studies	0.3	0.25	\$20,000	\$25,000

Survey Results

	Major sources of funding	Strengths of organization	Weaknesses of organization	Overcoming the weaknesses
<b>PCDC</b>	Federal, County/city government, Private foundation, individual/corporate revenues	Years of professional experience in operating technical & loan programs and providing job placement services	Need to provide more technical assistance to loan recipients	New & additional staffing
<b>AIBDC</b>	Private foundation, Individual/corporate revenues	Track records and know who to bring together	Understaffed, sometimes	
<b>PPL</b>	Federal/City/County government, Private foundations, Individual/corporate foundations, NRP	Ability to raise money needed, property payment and marketing	Lack a potential ? connection	Continued work to develop competitive relationships? where we want
<b>Lake St. Project</b>	NRP, Private foundations	Neighborhood based (Phillips, Powderhorn, Corcoran, Central), Business investment (Lake St. Council, Corporate sponsors: Honeywell, Allina, First Bank)	Lack of funds for implementation	NRP funding + corporate contributions
<b>Urban Venture</b>	Private foundation, Individual/corporate revenues	Wide networks of resources who support our work	Lack of time to attend all neighborhood organization meeting	
<b>People of Phillips</b>	State/County/City government, NRP, Private foundations	Ability to identify needs and organize focus groups to develop strategies for implementation.	Securing resources when needed or bringing about institutional changes as needed when needed!	Educating elected officials as to the benefit to support and work in favor of neighborhood
<b>Resource, Inc.</b>	Federal/state/county/city government, Private foundations	Skill training that is developed with input from business, particularly computer training	We cannot do economic development	We are not interested in doing direct ED, only the work skills preparation pieces.
<b>Lake St. Council</b>	NRP, Private foundations, Individual/corporate revenues, dues, fundraisers	Broad spectrum of board leadership, membership, community wide networking	Short money always	Not recreating, but collaborating, increase membership of services
<b>The Green Institute</b>	Federal/county/city government, NRP, Private foundations, Sales revenue	Thorough knowledge of Phillips; adequate resources for the short-term	Lack of a free-based revenue stream; no established track-record	Time, and some actual successes
<b>FABA</b>	County/city government, NRP, Membership fees	Direct contact with business owners	Only .25 FTE staff, depend on volunteers	Remain focused. Fundraising for staff funding

	Strengths of Phillips regarding CED	Weaknesses of Phillips regarding CED	Strengths of the Phillips economic development community	Weaknesses of the Phillips economic development community
PCDC	Needs for goods & services provide opportunities for entrepreneurs to develop business to satisfy these needs	Crime & perception of crime, lack of current commercial buildings to utilize, polluted land, applicants for loans who are poor risks & need major preparation assistance prior to starting a business	A lot of activity, wide ranging programming	Need more knowledge of what each other is doing and who to contact for specific action
AIBDC	Job force available, lots needed to be done here	It takes forever to get a major project completed. (more city delays than neighborhood)	Some good & long term agencies are here	
PPL	Great board and market	Somewhat unpredictable and vulnerable approval process when neighborhood approval is needed	Many diverse and committed organizations	Need more cooperation and coordination
Lake St. Project	Coalition, work force, involvement of residents, involvement of agencies	Crime, public, safety, image, poverty		
Urban Venture	Staff	To many layers of committee to get to action	Staff surveys good to determine needs of business community	Too many layers of government
People of Phillips	N/A	N/A	The understanding that cooperate ventures are the best approach to bring about significant change.	The lack of any one group (at this point) to step forward and carry the mantel for the neighborhood
Resource, Inc.	Labor pool, though generally unskilled		There seems to be a great deal of activities being undertaken...	Not particularly coordinated
Lake St. Council	Buildings, resources, labor force, institutions, organizations, and individual people	Must agree to some representational decision making, cannot accomplish goals with plurality approach	Buildings, resources, labor force, institutions, organizations, and individual people	Must agree to representational decision making, cannot accomplish goals with pluralistic approach
The Green Institute	Good baseline economic data; strong NRP plan; proximity to downtown business core	Lack of coordination and leadership on economic development issues	Many resources; comprehensive experience in housing, job creation, etc.	Lack of coordination; lack of strong financial controls in some cases
FABA	Diverse cultures make projects interesting; well organized, active community	Low income neighborhood; image and reality of safety issues	Many players	There is a whole lot of work to be done. Some competing interests/agencies of economic development players

## Survey Results

	How to improve the weaknesses	The role of your organization as relative to Phillips	CED activities in the next 5 years?
<b>PCDC</b>	"First call for help" type system for the neighborhood with a staff designed to keep current on what is available and to make referrals opportunity	Same because our main service area is Phillips and other areas have been added on a very minor scale.	Increase
<b>AIBDC</b>		Same	Probably increase
<b>PPL</b>		Unknown	Unknown
<b>Lake St. Project</b>		Different because we assist Phillips with economic development in the Lake St. corridor and make projects happen in the corridor.	Increase
<b>Urban Venture</b>	Streamline power	Same	Increase
<b>People of Phillips</b>	One group has to be willing to become the point for the neighborhood.	Same	Increase
<b>Resource, Inc.</b>	Bringing the practices together	Different because we can play a role in Phillips but our organization works across the metro area	Increase
<b>Lake St. Council</b>	Make a couple tough decisions with clear time lines and expectations and trust!	Different because the representational issues again - our decision ever is to be consulted on	Increase
<b>The Green Institute</b>	regular forum for info. exchanges; efforts to undertake joint projects; consolidations?	Same	Increase
<b>FABA</b>	Talk to each other, maximize resources	Different because FABA's role is to bring the view of businesses and non-profits into the discussion of issues on Franklin Ave.	Increase

## SURVEY RESULTS

[illegible]